Remarks/Arguments

1. *_Claim Rejections 35 USC 102*

In the final official action dated Dec. 5, 2006 independent claims 1, 9, 16, and
17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ottesen et
al. (US005930493A).

Applicant hereby cancels claims 1-74 and presents new claims 75-87. The
final rejection of the office with respect to independent claims 1, 9, 16 and 17
will be addressed herein with respect to applicant's new claims 75-87 as
exemplified by claim 75.

New claim 75 recites, inter alia, feature of "a converter including an input for
receiving media content formatted according to at least one of a plurality of media
formats, said converter providing at least one media block corresponding to at
least a portion of said media content, wherein said at least one media block
begins with an integral frame, said converter providing a corresponding media
block identifier for said at least one medial block..._"

Otteson states:

> " discrete source program segments that comprise the subscriber-selected
> multimedia program bitstreams are preferably transmitted as packets of
> segments in an asynchronous manner over the communication channel 44 to a
> plurality of target set-top control system 62. The compressed digitized program
> bitstream is then segmented or divided into a plurality of discrete video source
> program segments 48 by an index parser 33. Each discrete compressed digital
> video segment 48 is preferably representative of a predetermined – [we do not
> have to be predetermined amount of non-compressed, full-motion video.] In
> one embodiment, one second of non-compressed, full-motion video is
> represented by each of the compressed video [we are not compressing, we are
> transforming from compressed domain to compressed domain] segments 48.
> In another embodiment, two seconds of non-compressed, full-motion video is
> represented by each of the compressed video segments 48. It is to be
> understood that each of the source video segments 48 may be representative of
> a full-motion video portion greater than or less than one second. Alternatively,

> a varying duration of non-compressed, full-motion video may be represented
> by each of the compressed video segments 48."

Applicant's invention is distinguished from Ottesen in that each media block of applicant's invention begins with an integral frame. In contrast, Ottesen describes segments portioned by time. As a result the segments described by Ottesen could not be selected randomly from storage to comprise a video stream for playback, wherein the played back video stream comprised segments stitched together from non consecutive time segments from any starting point.

Applicant's argument made above with respect to claim 75 applies to applicant's new claims 75-88. Therefore applicant' believes the rejection of the final official action dated December 5, 2005 is overcome.

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

\CJ\
By: Christine Johnson
Reg. No. 38,507
Phone: 215-584-1159

June 5, 2007